UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,733	06/28/2001	Brian J. Kamrowski	2207/11658	3575

23838 7590 12/06/2006		EXAMINER
KENYON & KENYON LLP		SAIN, GAUTAM
1500 K STREET N.W.		

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K STREET N.W.
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 September 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1) This is a Final Rejection in response to arguments filed on 9/1/05.

2) Claims 1-28 are pending and rejected.

3) Examiner withdraws the 35 USC 112 of "standard escape notation" because the

Applicant points out (in the Specifications) that standard escape notation we well known

in the art (as indicated in the specification of 6/8/2001, page 4, line 6). This knowledge

(of being known in the art) can preclude the patentability of claim 9.

4) The Examiner withdraws the 35 USC 101 rejection for claims 1-28.

5) Effective filing date is 6/8/2001.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6) The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6-1) Claims 1-6, 11-19 and 24-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Unger et al (US 5991713, Nov 23, 1999).

Regarding claims 1, 13, 17, Unger teaches *accessing source HTML data,*

simplifying the HTML data, the simplifying minimizing the size of the HTML data,

knowledge of the HTML data being used during the simplification; encoding the

simplified HTML data; and storing the encoded HTML data. For example, Unger

discloses an efficient method for compressing, storing and transmitting natural language

text including HTML files identified by the author (col 8, lines 25-31). The examiner

interprets the disclosed author identifying as equivalent to the claimed accessing. The

complier parses the hypertext file in order to separate the tags from the corresponding

text and objects, thereafter, the complier compresses the text contained within the files

and stores the compressed text according to any suitable encoding technique including

Huffman, or simple run-length encoding (col 8, lines 45-52). The files can be

compressed using the encoding technique to make the contents of the file 2 to 10 times

smaller than the input source file that they were generated from (col 11, 55-59), which

the examiner equates to the claimed minimizing because making content 2 to 10 times

smaller is alteration of data to minimize.

Regarding claims 2, 15, 27, Unger teaches "transmitting ... access to the HTML

data". For example, Unger discloses an efficient method for compressing, storing and

transmitting natural language text including HTML files identified by the author (col 8,

lines 25-31).

Regarding claims 3, 16, 28, Unger teaches "transmitting ... computing device"

For example, Unger discloses an efficient method for compressing, storing and

transmitting natural language text including HTML files identified by the author (col 8,

lines 25-31).

Regarding claims 4, 14, 26, Unger teaches "HTML data ... web page" (ie., web

page)(col 12, line 41).

Regarding claims 5, 18, Unger teaches "simplification ... space ..." (ie., white

space)(col 10, lines 40-50).

Regarding claims 6, 19, Unger teaches "simplification ... HTML data" (ie.,

compression of text files ... encoding documents ... words or strings ...)(col 8, line 55 –

col 10, line 67).

Regarding claim 11, Unger teaches "encoding ... Huffman ... HTML data" (col

8, line 52).

Regarding claim 12, Unger teaches "storing ... cache" (ie., cache with

browser)(col 12, lines 45-50; fig 11, item 86, 88).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7)   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7-1)   Claims 7, 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Unger (as cited above), in view of Povilus (US 5740425, issued Apr 1998).

Regarding claims 7, 20, Unger does not expressly teach, but Povilus teaches

"simplification ... HTML data" (ie., normalizing SKU tables for catalogs; HTML data)(col

29, lines 30-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Unger to include normalizing tables for catalogs for HTML as taught

by Povilus, providing the benefit of compression of SGML/HTML data on the internet

(col 29, lines 30-55).

7-2)   Claims 8, 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Unger (as cited above), in view of <u>Chanod</u> et al (US 6393389, filed Sep 1999).

Regarding claims 8, 21, Unger does not expressly teach, but Chanod teaches "simplification ... HTML data" (ie., HTML tags formatted)(col 23, line 39)(ie., reorder tokens)(col 20, lines 10-11)(ie., rewriting rules ... reorder entries)(col 24, lines 40-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Unger to include HTML tags formatted and rewriting rules to reorder entries as taught in Chanod, providing the benefit of formatting information and logical structure such as HTML tags (col 10, lines 14-17).

7-3)   Claims 9, 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Unger (as cited above), in view of <u>Anderson</u> et al (US US 6021202, issued Feb 2000).

Regarding claims 9, 22, Unger does not expressly teach, but Anderson teaches "simplification ... escape notation" (ie., escape sequence ... ASCII formats)(col 19, lines 15-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Unger to include escape sequence as taught in Anderson, providing the benefit of data compress (col 19, line 22) with HTML data (col 18, line 24).

7-4)   Claims 10, 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Unger (as cited above), in view of <u>Burrows</u> et al (US 5963954, issued Oct, 1999).

Regarding claims 10, 23, Unger does not teach, but Burrows teaches

"simplification ... HTML data into a single byte" (ie., abc word stored as one or more

bytes)(col 9, line 65 – col 10, line 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Unger to include storing words as one byte or more as taught in

Burrows, providing the benefit of compression of data structures (col 4, lines 33-40) in

extremely large and complex databases that are dispersed over millions of different

computers all over the world (col 1, lines 22-60).

Response to Arguments

8)   Applicant's arguments filed 9/1/05 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant argues that the references do not teach simplifying

the HTML data, the simplifying minimizing the size of the HTML data because the

references do not teach alteration of data (see Remarks, pages 8-10). The examiner

disagrees. For example, Unger discloses an efficient method for compressing, storing

and transmitting natural language text including HTML files identified by the author (col

8, lines 25-31). The examiner interprets the disclosed author identifying as equivalent

to the claimed accessing. The complier parses the hypertext file in order to separate

the tags from the corresponding text and objects, thereafter, the complier compresses

the text contained within the files and stores the compressed text according to any

suitable encoding technique including Huffman, or simple run-length encoding (col 8,

lines 45-52). The files can be compressed using the encoding technique to make the

contents of the file 2 to 10 times smaller than the input source file that they were generated from (col 11, 55-59), which the examiner equates to the claimed minimizing because making content 2 to 10 times smaller is alteration of data to minimize.

Regarding claim 9, Applicant argues that Unger in view of Anderson does not teach use of standard escape notation (Remarks, page 10). The examiner disagrees. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Under's teaching of compressing text according to any suitable encoding technique including Huffman, or simple run-length encoding (col 8, lines 45-52) to include encoding using SGML escape sequence for as taught by Anderson (col 19, lines 15-22) for compressing data with HTML data (col 19, line 22, col 18, line 24).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GS   12/1/06
GS

H Herndon
Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100